

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-7, 9-11 and 13-16 are amended and new claim 17 is added. The amendments to claims 1, 10, and 13 are supported by Fig. 1 and the specification on pages 5, 6, 10 and 11, for example. Amendments to claim 11 are supported by the specification on page 10, second full paragraph, for example. Claim 17 is supported by the specification on page 19, the last three paragraphs and Figs. 9 and 10, for example. No new matter is introduced.

Entry of the amendments to claims 1-7, 9-11 and 13-16 is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 because the amendments: a) place the application in condition for allowance (for all the reasons discussed herein); b) do not raise any new issues requiring further search or consideration; and c) place the application in better form for appeal (if necessary). Accordingly, entry is proper under 37 CFR §1.116.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-10 and 13-16 under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Lee (U.S. Patent No. 6,208,427) in view of Matsushita (U.S. Patent No. 6,813,036). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action asserts that Lee discloses a storage part that stores user information and information on an instruction form management apparatus holding an instruction form accessible to the user. However, Lee does not disclose or suggest anything regarding user information or an instruction form management apparatus, as recited in claims 1, 10, 13 and 16. All that Lee discloses is a PDA that could send a fax transmission after deciding whether to insert a header or not based on the header flag information and setting the fax margins. Lee does not disclose or suggest transmitting a fax note as instructions to be received by a receiving facsimile machine. Rather, Lee discloses that the PDA retrieves the fax note (i.e., content of a fax), whether to add a header or not based on a header flag, and setting margins of the fax note to generate and transmit a fax, which is well known to be a bit map having no

instructions. Lee does not disclose transmitting instructions in a fax, but building a fax transmission based on the instructions.

Further, there is nothing disclosed in Lee regarding storing user information that is associated with an instruction form or storing information on an instruction form management apparatus, as recited in claims 1, 10, 13 and 16. Additionally, Lee does not disclose an instruction form management apparatus or an input part that inputs information on a user or a retrieval part that retrieves information on the instruction form management apparatus that are also recited in claims 1, 10, 13 and 16.

In fact, Lee has no need of these missing elements because in Lee, the user enters into the PDA whether a fax header should be reproduced and the fax margins to be used. There are no other apparatus contemplated in Lee except the receiving facsimile machine that prints faxes. Thus, Lee does not disclose or suggest outputting instructions indicated in an instruction form, a storage for storing user information and information on an instruction for management apparatus, and input part for inputting the information on the user or a retrieving part for retrieving information on the instruction form management apparatus, as recited in claims 1, 10, 13 and 16.

The Office Action admits that Lee fails to explicitly teach the user information associated with the fax note but asserts that Matsushita discloses an internet facsimile machine that accepts facsimile transmission that includes user information citing the Abstract and col. 1, lines 40-67 and col. 2, lines 1-67. However, Matsushita is not directed to accepting facsimile transmission that includes user information, but rather for sending facsimile transmissions. In particular, Matsushita discloses:

Transmission instruction means is provided for instructing execution of internet transmission according to an address determined by the identification information input means and the presented candidate determining means. The transmission instruction means instructs the execution of internet transmission according to an address determined including, for example, characters and

numerals, by the identification information input means and the presented candidate determining means. In this arrangement, the information relating to the user preferably includes a name of domain.

(Matsushita, C2-L33-43.) Thus, Matsushita is directed to transmission of a facsimile according to an address determined by an identification information inputted by a user via the input means.

While Matsushita does disclose having necessary information such as the addressee of the information to be transmitted, (see Matsushita, C6/L3-5), this added information is transmitted as a facsimile (header information in a bit map) not as text data to be used by the receiving facsimile machine. In fact, Matsushita discloses nothing regarding what occurs at the receiving facsimile machine but rather is directed to a technique for easily identifying a domain name for an internet facsimile transmission.

The Office Action asserts that Lee and Matsushita are analogous art because both teach the transmission of instructions to a facsimile device. Applicants respectfully disagree. As discussed above, Lee does not transmit instructions, but only a bit map fax. Matsushita does not disclose or suggest transmitting instructions via facsimile transmission. Rather, Matsushita discloses entering user information to assist the user in selecting a domain address as a destination address. There is nothing in Matsushita disclosing transmitting instructions or user information to a destination facsimile machine.

Further, Lee and Matsushita individually or in combination do not disclose associating user information with an instruction form management apparatus holding an instruction form. As discussed above, Lee only discloses the user setting facsimile margins and whether the header should be inserted in the fax or not. And even in these two instructions, Lee does not transmit the instructions, but implement the instructions in the bit map to be faxed. Matsushita inputs user information for selecting of a domain address and does not send instructions to the receiving facsimile machine nor associates the user information with any

kind of instructions. There is no motivation for such association in Lee and Matsushita because there is no benefit or function that would require such an association disclosed in Lee or Matsushita.

Further, neither Lee nor Matsushita discloses a retrieval part for retrieving information on the instruction form management apparatus holding the instruction form based on the information on the user input by the input part as recited in claims 1, 10, 13 and 16. Lee does not recognize an instruction form management apparatus much less information regarding such an apparatus. Thus, Lee does not suggest or disclose a retrieval part that retrieves information regarding the instruction form management apparatus. Matsushita does not disclose or suggest or even recognize having an instruction form, an instruction form management apparatus or a retrieval part for retrieving information related to the instructions form management apparatus. Thus, Lee and Matsushita, individually or in combination do not disclose or suggest all the limitations recited in claims 1, 10, 13 and 16.

In view of the above, Lee and Matsushita disclose none of the subject matter recited in claims 1, 1, 13 and 16. Claims 2-9 depend from claim 1 and claims 14 and 15 depend from claim 13. Thus, Lee and Matsushita individually or in combination do not disclose the subject matter recited in claims 1-10 and 13-16. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-10 and 13-16 under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully solicited.

The Office Action rejects claims 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Kadowaki (U.S. Patent No. 6,674,537) in view of Lee and further in view of Matsushita. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action asserts that Kadowaki discloses a storage medium holding information on an instruction form management apparatus. However, claims 11 and 12 recite a storage medium that holds information on a plurality of instruction form management apparatus. Lee and Matsushita do not disclose a plurality of instruction form apparatus.


Thus, Kadowaki, Lee and Matsushita do not disclose the subject matter recited in claims 11 and 12. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully solicited.

New claim 17 recites an attachment part that attaches a storage medium that stores an instruction form that includes processing instructions and a processing part that executes the processing instructions to process information not stored in the storage medium. None of Lee, Matsushita and Kadowaki disclose the subject matter recited in claim 17. Thus, claim 17 is patentable over Lee, Matsushita and Kadowaki.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claim 1-17 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further will be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Paul Tsou
Registration No. 37,956

JAO:PT/scg
Attachment:
Amendment Transmittal

Date: October 16, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--